

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexamdria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/662,181                        | 09/14/2000  | Richard J. McCurdy   | L10389                   | 2443             |  |
| 7590 03/30/2005                   |             |                      | EXAMINER                 |                  |  |
| Philip S Oberlin                  |             |                      | CHEN, BRET P             |                  |  |
| Marshall & Mel<br>Four Seagate Ei |             |                      | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER    |                  |  |
| Toledo, OH 43604                  |             |                      | 1762                     |                  |  |
|                                   |             |                      | DATE MAII ED: 03/30/2005 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 09/662,181      | MCCURDY ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |  |
| B. Chen         | 1762           |  |  |

| g   | CAMINITE  | Aitonit  |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
|   | B. Chen   | 1762   |   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 17 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS  | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO   | R ALLOWANCE.   |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amend condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. Th</li> <li>The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of this A</li> </ol>                                  | a Notice of Appeal. To avoid aband<br>lment, affidavit, or other evidence, veral fee) in compliance with 37 CFR of<br>e reply must be filed within one of the of the final rejection.<br>Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth | donment of this applic<br>which places the appl<br>41.31; or (3) a Reque<br>he following time peri<br>in the final rejection, wh | cation in<br>st for Continued<br>ods:<br>ichever is later. In |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I<br>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or<br>TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | -  |   |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>r than three months after the mailing da   | of the fee. The appropri<br>inally set in the final Offi   | ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) a                      |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Approximate was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4 Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 Chas been filed, any reply must be filed within the time per AMENIANTALE.</li> </ol>  | 1.37 must be filed within two month CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of  | s of the date of filing  | the Notice of   |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,   |   |  | ecause  |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |   | ected claims.  |   |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1   |   | mpliant Amendment  | (PTOL-324).   |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | •   |  | -   |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |   | ll be entered and an e   | explanation of  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar   | overcome all rejections under appea   | al and/or appellant fai  | ls to provide a   |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | =   |  | •   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but of the reasons noted on the following page(s).</li> </ol>  | it does NOT place the application in  | n condition for allowar  | nce because:  |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 13. Other:  | , , ,   | · · <del></del>  |   |  |  |  |
| · <del></del>   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|   |   | ,  |   |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 09/662,181

Art Unit: 1762

The Request for Reconsideration dated 2/17/05 has been entered and carefully considered. The arguments presented are not deemed persuasive because of the reasons listed below:

Applicant first argues that an interference should be declared (pp.14-18).

The examiner disagrees. It is noted that the copied claim is directed to a method of providing an article and depositing a sodium ion diffusion barrier layer by CVD followed by depositing a photocatalytically-activated self-cleaning coating by CVD over said sodium barrier layer. The parameters set forth by applicant's invention is clearly different from that of US Patent 6,027,766 as noted in the tables provided on pp.15-16 of the Request for Reconsideration. At the present time, the applicant has not been able to establish possession of the subject matter of the '766 Patent. As such, if there is no same patentable invention, there is no interference. *Winter v. Fujita* 53 USPQ2d 1234 (BdPatApp&Int 1999). Hence, the examiner has determined that there is no interfering subject matter and an interference is not being declared at this time.

Applicant next argues that the 112 rejection should be withdrawn because the multiple McCurdy Declarations overcome all the new matter rejections (pp.18-20).

The examiner disagrees. It is noted that no new arguments have been provided and that the Declarations have been addressed in previous office actions. The examiner will not rehash them here.

Art Unit: 1762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to B. Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1417. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bc 3/23/05

BRET CHEN PRIMARY EXAMINER